



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/806,180	06/05/2001	Stephen William Colley	KPT 1090	5384
321	7590	07/19/2006	EXAMINER	
SENNIGER POWERS ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE 16TH FLOOR ST LOUIS, MO 63102			MANOHARAN, VIRGINIA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1764	

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

The drawings are objected to because the drawing filed on November 16, 2004 should read annotated, replacement or new in the margins to comply with the requirements of 37CFR 1.121. Also, it is noteworthy that any character(s) added to the drawing(s) must be defined in the specification.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 1764

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-14 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 & 12-17; and claims 1 & 11-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,809,217 and 6,632,330 respectively. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter of the instant claims is generic or is covered in the claims of the above patents.

Claims 1-14 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1 & 12-17 and claims 1 & 11-20 of U. S. Patent No. 6,809,217 and 6,632,330 respectively since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

Art Unit: 1764

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: a process which comprises: providing a first distillation at a first pressure, which are effective for distillation from a mixture comprising ethyl acetate, ethanol and water of a first distillate; providing a second distillation zone maintained under distillation conditions which include use of a second distillation pressure higher than the first distillation pressure, which are effective for distillation from a mixture comprising ethyl acetate, ethanol and water of a second distillate comprising ethanol, water, and a minor proportion of ethyl acetate, and which yield an ethyl acetate bottom product; supplying material of the first distillate to the second distillation zone.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1764

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0151886 with or without Japan 5186392.

EP '886 is applied for the same reasons as set forth at pages 3-4 of the previous Office action. The EP '886 differs from the claimed invention in that claim 1, for example, requires separating an ester such as ethyl acetate from a feedstock comprising ethyl acetate, ethanol and water, and in which a first distillate comprising ethyl acetate, ethanol and not more than about 10 mol % water is recovered from a first distillation. However, said difference is deemed not to constitute a patentable distinction inasmuch as the product or material-in-process maybe new or unobvious but "product" is not the basis for patentability of a method/process claims. Nonetheless, JP '392 teaches, abstract, that a process of recovering ethyl acetate without ethanol and water from distillation columns is a known expediency in the art. To combine JP'392 process with EP '886 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, especially since EP' 886 mentioned at page 14, line 24 to a water reaction mixture including ethanol, ethyl acetate and water.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Virginia Manoharan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1450. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 7:00a.m to 6:00p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola, can be reached on 571-272-1444. The

Art Unit: 1764

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9311.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


VIRGINIA MANOHARAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 133 / 1764
7/15/06